

Report of the Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Revisit to San Francisco State University

Professional Services Division

November 10, 2009

Overview

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visits to San Francisco State University that were conducted April 14-18, 2007 and April 24-25, 2008. This item provides the report of the joint NCATE-CTC revisit team and recommendations regarding stipulations and the accreditation status.

Staff Recommendations

1. That two remaining stipulations be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS** to **ACCREDITATION**.

Background Information

A COA accreditation team conducted a site visit at San Francisco State University on April 14-18, 2007. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for San Francisco State University and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**.

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a revisit within one year of the accreditation action. The institution prepared a document indicating how each of the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The revisit was conducted by the original team leader and CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus, the team prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action.

Following are the stipulations from the original accreditation visit and the 2008 Revisit team's recommendations:

| Stipulations from the 2007 Visit | 2008 Revisit Team Recommendations |
|---|---|
| 1. That the unit provide evidence that institutional leadership supports a vision for professional preparation programs with clear communication and articulation among all programs within the unit. | The team recommended that the stipulation be removed. |
| 2. That the unit ensures cohesive management with clear lines of authority and responsibility among all | The team recommended that the stipulation be removed. |

| Stipulations from the 2007 Visit | 2008 Revisit Team Recommendations |
|--|--|
| programs within the unit. | |
| 3. That the unit provide evidence of implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all program credential areas. | The unit provide an update in one year on the implementation of the assessment system, including documentation of the utilization of the data for program improvement. |
| 4. That the unit provide evidence that every program has a systematic fieldwork sequence that meets the program standards and that district and university field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, oriented and assessed. | The team recommended that the stipulation be removed. |
| 5. That the unit provide evidence that all program standards less than fully met are now met. | That the unit provide evidence that the three standards that are <i>Met with Concerns</i> are fully met. |
| 6. That the unit provide evidence that the institution provides sufficient resources to the unit in relation to the student population it is required to serve. The resources must enable each program to effectively operate in terms of resources, coordination, recruitment, advisement, program development and instruction. | The team recommended that the stipulation be removed. |

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) took action at its June 2008 meeting to remove four of the six stipulations and amend the remaining stipulations as was recommended by the revisit team. The COA stated that when the joint NCATE-CTC Focused Visit takes place in fall 2009, that San Francisco State University should provide evidence that the two remaining stipulations have been addressed.

Joint NCATE-CTC Revisit-November 2009

In November 2009, a joint NCATE-CTC Focused Site Visit took place. Two stipulations from the original 2007 site visit were continued after the 2008 revisit. The table below provides the remaining original stipulations, the 2008 revisit team's recommendation regarding the continued stipulations and the 2009 revisit team recommendations.

| Stipulations from the 2007 Joint Visit | 2008 Stipulations | 2009 Revisit Team Recommendations |
|---|---|--|
| That the unit provide evidence of implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all program credential areas. | The unit provide an update in one year on the implementation of the assessment system, including documentation of the utilization of the data for | The team recommends that the stipulation be removed. |

| Stipulations from the 2007 Joint Visit | 2008 Stipulations | 2009 Revisit Team Recommendations |
|---|--|--|
| | program improvement. | |
| That the unit provide evidence that every program has a systematic fieldwork sequence that meets the program standards and that district and university field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, oriented and assessed. | That the unit provide evidence that the three standards that are <i>Met with Concerns</i> are fully met. | The team recommends that the stipulation be removed. |

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM REVISIT REPORT**

Institution: San Francisco State University

Dates of Revisit: November 9-10, 2009

**Original
COA Accreditation
Decision:** ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

2009 Revisit Team Recommendations

The team recommends that:

1. That two remaining stipulations be removed.
2. That the accreditation decision be changed from **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS** to **ACCREDITATION**.

Rationale

Based upon the institutional response to the stipulations, review of supporting evidence and interviews with faculty members and institutional administration the team determined that the institution has provided responses to each of the stipulations and made substantial progress towards meeting the stipulations. In addition, the institution has addressed the standards less than fully met which were identified during the accreditation visit and continued from the revisit one year ago. All program and Common Standards are met at this time.

Team Leader: John Sweeney, Co-Chair
Freed-Hardeman University

Joel A. Colbert, Co-Chair
Chapman University

RoSusan D. Bartee
The University of Mississippi

Delores Varetta Hurt
Paducah Independent School District, Kentucky

Staff: Teri Clark, Administrator

Below are listed the stipulations approved by the COA after the revisit in 2008 followed by the 2009 team findings. After this section, the revisit team findings on the NCATE/Common Standards and program standards are included.

Findings on Stipulations

Original Stipulation #3

That the unit provide evidence of implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all program credential areas.

Institutional Response (2008)

The COE has recently developed a comprehensive unit assessment system, under the direction of the new accreditation coordinator who meets regularly with all of the stakeholders at SFSU, both within and outside the unit, to continue to develop the system. While the system has not been implemented yet, system development is progressing and data collection will begin in spring 2008.

Revisit Team Finding (2008)

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this stipulation prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, and staff, the team confirms that the university is developing a unit assessment system that will provide the data necessary to make informed decisions for program improvement.

Revisit Team Recommendation (2008)

The team suggests a report be submitted in one year documenting the progress of the implementation of the assessment system and the formulation and implementation of a plan for using the data generated by the new assessment system for program improvement. Therefore the team recommends an amended stipulation:

2008 Stipulation

The unit provide an update in one year on the implementation of the assessment system, including documentation of the utilization of the data for program improvement.

2009 Joint Revisit Recommendation (2009)

The team recommends this stipulation be removed. Specifics are provided in the NCATE-CTC portion of this report beginning on page 8.

Stipulation #5

That the unit provide evidence that all program standards less than fully met are now met.

Institutional Response (2008)

The COE submitted reports for each of the programs with standards less than fully met in the April 2007 accreditation visit. For each program, the program leadership and faculty have reviewed the design of the program and made appropriate modifications to address the standards.

Revisit Team Finding (2008)

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, field supervisors, cooperating teachers, site administrators, and students, the

team confirms that the COE has made significant progress to meet all of the standards that were less than fully met. For two of the programs with findings of standards Not Met, the three standards in question are now ***Met with Concerns***.

Revisit Team Recommendation (2008)

The team suggests that monitoring of SFSU continue for one additional year to allow the two programs that have not fully met all standards to submit additional information documenting the completion of planned activities. Therefore the team recommends that the stipulation be amended:

2008 Stipulation

That the unit provide evidence that the three standards that are *Met with Concerns* are fully met.

2009 Joint Revisit Recommendation (2009)

The team recommends this stipulation be removed. Specifics are provided on pages 14-15 of this report.

NCATE/Common Standards

Findings on NCATE/Common Standards Concerns

The accreditation team articulated concerns related to NCATE/Common standards specific to individual standards. The institution has addressed each of the concerns in the following manner:

NCATE Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

While there is substantial candidate assessment data collected for most programs, data are not systematically summarized and used by the unit.

Institutional Response (2008)

The SFSU COE reports that a new accreditation coordinator has been identified and that the coordinator has worked with the administration, faculty, chairs, and coordinators to develop a new comprehensive unit assessment system that will provide systematic data on all candidates that will be used for program improvement purposes.

Revisit Team Findings (2008)

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this concern, prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, students, and staff, the team confirms that a comprehensive unit assessment system is currently under development and that implementation will begin in the spring 2008. The team recommends that a progress report be submitted in one year documenting the implementation of the system and the formulation of a plan to use the data generated for continued program improvement. This standard is still ***Met with Concerns***.

Revisit Team Findings (2009)

The joint NCATE-CTC report, beginning on page 8, provides information related to the portion of NCATE Standard 1 that was not found to be fully met. The team finds that NCATE Standard 1 is **Met**.

NCATE Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

Data are collected programmatically but are not used to inform the unit where changes are needed. There is a lack of evidence that a program assessment system is utilized across the unit.

Rationale: The state requirement for meeting this standard is substantially different from that of NCATE. At present, the state standard requires that designated stakeholders (program participants, graduates and local practitioners) are involved in a comprehensive evaluation of courses and field experiences that lead to substantive improvements in credential programs. It was judged that evaluation data are collected from stakeholders, but evidence of the coordination and utilization of that data was not available.

Institutional Response (2008)

The SFSU COE reports that a new accreditation coordinator has been identified and that the coordinator has worked with the administration, faculty, chairs, and coordinators to develop a new comprehensive unit assessment system that will provide systematic data on all candidates that will be used for program improvement purposes. The assessment system is organized around seven key categories that address the California program standards and NCATE standards. The system is integrated with the campus-wide data system and faculty report that it is easy to use. Data on key assessments are entered at the same time as course grades. Programs identified the key assignments that compose the assessment system. The initial use of the system is planned for Spring 2008.

Revisit Team Findings (2008)

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this concern prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, students, and staff, the team confirms that a comprehensive unit assessment system is currently under development and that implementation will begin in the spring 2008. The team recommends that a progress report be submitted in one year documenting the implementation of the system and the formulation of a plan to use the data generated for continued program improvement. This standard is still **Met with Concerns**.

Revisit Team Findings (2009)

The joint NCATE-CTC report, beginning on page 8, provides information related to NCATE Standard 2. The team finds that NCATE Standard 2 is **Met**.

NCATE-CTC Joint Focused Site Visit

San Francisco State University (SFSU) is a large urban public institution of higher education that is over 100 years old with approximately 29,000 students. It is an ethnically and racially diverse institution with over 70% of its students identified as people of color. The institution has a long history in preparing teachers and other school personnel for employment in diverse and dynamic

educational and clinical settings. SFSU began 1899 as a two-year state supported Normal School, it was the first such school in California which required a high school diploma for admission.

The university's mission reflects its dedication in acknowledging and developing this diverse student body:

- To create and maintain an environment for learning that promotes respect for and appreciation of scholarship, freedom, human diversity, and the cultural mosaic of the City of San Francisco and the Bay Area.
- To promote excellence in instruction and intellectual accomplishment.
- To provide broadly accessible higher education for residents of the region and state, as well as the nation and world.

The university awards Bachelor's degrees in 115 areas of specialization, Master's degrees in 95 areas of specialization, a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree with a concentration in Special Education, jointly with University of California at Berkeley, a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership, an M.S. in physical therapy leading to a clinical doctoral degree (D.P.T.) and a research doctorate for licensed physical therapists (D.P.T.Sc.), jointly with University of California at San Francisco. It also offers 25 credential programs of which 19 at the initial level and 6 advanced level credentials, as well as 36 undergraduate and graduate certificate programs.

The university has eight academic colleges, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Business, Creative Arts, Education, Ethnic Studies, Health and Human Services, Humanities and Science and Engineering, and is accredited through a comprehensive University Program Review that is regularly conducted by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The following Colleges offer the 25 credentials mentioned above: Behavioral and Social Sciences, Education and Health and Human Services. In addition, the Colleges of Creative Arts, Humanities and Science and Engineering, offer discipline-specific classes related to various credentials, and the Dean of the College of Education is the designated campus Unit Head for all credentials.

The primary route to earning a credential in California is at the graduate level following completion of a bachelor's degree. Universities are not allowed to offer an undergraduate major in Education. There are some exceptions to this, where combined programs, linked to an undergraduate major, such as Child and Adolescent Development end in a credential at the post-baccalaureate level.

Teacher education candidates who are interested in teaching at the high school level enroll in the academic major of the subject they wish to teach. The completion of an approved subject matter program or passing the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) for the chosen subject matter are prerequisites for admission in the secondary teacher education professional program that leads to the credential in a designated subject area.

Once students earn their bachelor's degrees with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.67 or 2.75 for their last 60 units, meet Basic Skills requirement and a subject matter requirement, they may apply for admission to an SFSU's credential program, which includes basic general education teaching credentials, specialist credentials, services credentials. In addition, students may apply for master's degrees or doctoral study.

Conceptual Framework Summary

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION'S VISION

Preparing reflective and innovative professionals as leaders to ensure the educational development of diverse populations within dynamic educational contexts.

The College of Education at San Francisco State University adopted the *Vision Statement* in February, 1995 for its professional programs. The statement and knowledge base was further refined May, 1999 and reviewed and revised again September, 2006. This vision statement is the essence of the conceptual framework that undergirds the programs in the College of Education (COE) and other programs in the unit. The vision, its knowledge base, and the conceptual framework have been reviewed annually by the unit

The key elements of the vision are:

Reflective and Innovative Professionals: Those who reflect on situations from multiple perspectives, developing insight and cultivating self-evaluation and self-awareness that lead to new understandings of action situations and self as teacher.

Diverse Populations: Broadly defined, those exhibiting a wide range of cognitive, linguistic, cultural, social, and physical differences to include those with disabilities. Diverse populations are taken to mean social groups with cultural and behavioral patterns and values that may not be dominant in the culture shared by most of the community/society but which shape the identity of individuals who identify with the particular social group. Throughout the document diverse populations, educational contexts, and educational professionals are constructed in the broadest possible sense.

Dynamic Educational Contexts: Those school and community environments that have experienced rapid shifts in demographics, resources, and social demands, and are in a continual state of flux. Educational professionals must value and understand the implications of change in specific practical contexts, and in the context of community and society.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION'S MISSION STATEMENT

The College of Education will develop and maintain rigorous professional preparation in the pedagogical and clinical skills that our professionals are required to use in providing effective services to individuals and their families, especially for those residing in ethnically and racially diverse communities.

All programs are based on excellence in teaching and clinical services, with a commitment to research and scholarship, focusing on the integration of services to schools and community agencies.

This mission statement is consistent with the mission and goals and purposes of San Francisco State University. It is reflected in each department's missions, goals, and/or purposes. The goals that have developed out of the unit's shared vision, mission, and knowledge base are:

- To prepare professional educators and service providers to effectively work with individuals of all ages, diverse cultures, languages, learning styles, abilities, sensory and physical challenges, ethnicity, and sexual orientations, in schools and other community settings.
- To integrate education with community services.
- To effectively use technology to improve education and community services.
- To prepare educational leaders to be socially committed advocates for the people they serve.
- To contribute to the knowledge base of the profession, with an emphasis in the area of urban education.
- To support faculty in their discipline-focused activities, their interdisciplinary programs, their teaching, and their research.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews.

☒ Yes ☐ No

| | Unacceptable | Acceptable | Target |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 2a. Assessment System Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | |
| 2a. Assessment System Advanced Preparation | | X | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings:</i></p> <p>SFSU has developed a comprehensive summative assessment system. The institution used a developmental process that included input from faculty and administrators and coordinated by the Acting Coordinator of Accreditation and Evaluation, who reports directly to the Dean. The Acting Coordinator established a stakeholder committee that included various College of Education coordinators.</p> <p>The stakeholder committee's first task was to analyze the various standards against which the system would be held accountable, including state standards for each credential program and identify the elements that were common to all of these standards.</p> <p>The second task was for program coordinators to identify a key assignment that represented the goals of each course that could be used for assessment purposes. Subsequently, the Evaluation Committee, in consultation with faculty, agreed on a scoring rubric and range common for all of the key assignments.</p> <p>The third task was to identify and compare commercial assessment systems that could be used. TK20, Taskstream, and LiveText were reviewed by the coordinator and the College of Education technology staff using several criteria: ease in data collection, storage, retrieval, reporting, and design. None were found to be well-suited. A series of meetings were conducted with Robert Maples, the campus director of SFSU's student information management system (SIMS), to see if the system currently in place could be modified to include the new assessment system. After</p> | | | |

considering all of the needs and issues with modifying SIMS, it was decided to move forward and do so. The driving force was that since faculty already used SIMS to input student grades, they would be able to input key assessment scores in a similar manner, making it relatively easy for faculty to input data needed for assessment purposes.

The purpose of the formative evaluation system is to track and report on the progress of credential candidates at key transition points as they move through the program and across programs. The Acting Coordinator, working with various stakeholders across campus, began a series of meetings to modify SIMS further to add formative assessment data collection points. In August 2009, field-testing the formative system commenced. Currently, trouble shooting the system is in progress, with full implementation scheduled for AY 10-11.

The results of using the summative assessment system were culled from data in the spring, summer, and fall, 08, and spring, 09 terms. Key assignment data were scored utilizing rubrics on a scale of 1 (not-mastered) to 4 (exceeds mastery).

Three levels of data were included: unit-level aggregated data (integrates all credentials and courses for a term); program-level aggregated data (integrates all courses for a term for each credential, but maintains each credential's identity); and program-level data (summarizes results for each course in a term for a given credential).

Strengths

Strengths include:

1. The system has been almost universally accepted by the faculty.
2. The assessment system was fully adopted within a few terms.
3. Faculty began to use the data to assess what was working well and where adjustments needed to be made.
4. Full implementation of the system is still in the early stages and developmental, but all of the stakeholders are fully committed to integrating the system into the College of Education and to continually revise as needed.

Conclusions

The faculty, under the leadership of the Dean and Acting Coordinator of Accreditation and Evaluation, developed a comprehensive summative assessment system using many of the resources already available within the university. The summative system is currently implemented and the faculty are using the data to assess and revise their courses and programs. The formative system is currently being beta-tested and should be fully operational in AY 10-11.

| | Unacceptable | Acceptable | Target |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 2b. Data Collection, Analysis, & Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | |
| 2b. Data Collection, Analysis, & Evaluation– Advanced Preparation | | X | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings:</i></p> <p>The Student Information Management System (SIMS) is the comprehensive system used to collect formative and summative data regarding candidates' entry level qualifications and</p> | | | |

subsequent areas of competency and proficiency. Infrastructural capacity building efforts involved collaborative efforts with San Diego State University to create SIMS as the primary venue for ascertaining assessment data using their shared resources. Other infrastructural capacity building efforts included the establishment of a NCATE Evaluation Committee to develop transition points, comprise course rubrics, determine technological needs, and address related logistical aspects for the assessment system.

Unit-level aggregated data, program-level aggregated data, program level data, and different forms of aggregate data have been collected and analyzed for the past two academic years as summative data. More than 98% of the candidates in the Spring of 2008 and the Summer of 2008 scored three (3) or four (4) on the key assignments within the credential courses while in the Fall of 2008 and in the Spring of 2009, more than 88% of the candidates scored accordingly in these same areas. Discussion from the focus group reveals important benchmarks for the assessment cycle of data collection: Admissions (February 15th is the application deadline for fall enrollment); Application for Culminating Practicum/Internship (specified 700 level course which involves a visit to the site supervisor); Culminating Practicum/Internship (specified 800 level course where candidates are provided the opportunity to summarize their experiences in a holistic manner); and Post-Culminating Practicum/Internship (fulfilled after completion of the specified 800 level course). Unlike the other identified components for the assessment system, field experiences and internship evaluations are required two consecutive periods within the timeline.

Exit surveys are conducted upon completion of the program while post graduate surveys are administered at the end of the first and third years after having completed the program. Findings from a post-graduate survey, the *Rehabilitation Services Credential in Orientation and Mobility*, indicate that evaluation for graduates as well as the employers of former graduates received average ratings of 4.8 accordingly. Additionally, the *CSU System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation: Summary Update for the CSU Deans of Education*, as another external source of data, provides evidence to demonstrate the ongoing communication efforts between the graduates of the SFSU program and the respective employers. It is important to note, however, since all candidates fulfill credentials based upon the same requirements, the capacity to disaggregate data according to off-campus, alternate route, and distance learning programs has been established but not implemented. Discussion from the focus group indicates that plans are in place to proceed toward disaggregating and examining data within these particular programs.

Program faculty have developed course rubrics aligning with the Conceptual Framework (i.e. Reflective and Innovative Professionals, Diverse Population, Dynamic Education Contexts) and the Comprehensive Assessment Structure (i.e. foundational knowledge, discipline specific knowledge, needs assessment, goal setting, managing service delivery, evaluating outcomes, professional dispositions) for the purposes of assessing the key assignments in the respective courses. Discussion from the focus group indicates that data is collected each semester by the program coordinators who synthesizes and submits the data in table form to the NCATE coordinator. The NCATE coordinator, who is also the evaluation/assessment specialist, maintains the responsibility of approving the course rubrics, reviews departmental data, and requires program coordinators to construct reflections about the implications of their evaluative data.

The College of Education adheres to the university's grade appeals procedures and, more specifically, the Grade Appeals Committee in the College of Education is established to review pertinent cases. Discussion from the focus group indicates faculty members are encouraged to

include the process of grades' appeals on their course syllabus. Discussion from the focus group also indicated that candidates filing grade appeals have been minimal as only one case was cited during the previous academic year of 2008-2009. Confidential files related to the grade appeals are maintained within the Office of the Associate Dean or designated office in the College of Education or within the College of Humanities depending upon the program affiliation of the candidate.

Summary of Strengths:

The unit has made a substantial effort to ensure that an assessment system has been established. Infrastructural capacity has provided the basis for sustaining the assessment system. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation components have been addressed in important ways to implement steps toward enhancing the processes.

| | | | |
|--|--|----------|--|
| 2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | |
| 2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation | | X | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings:</i></p> <p>While the implementation of SIMS for the data collection system has only been used since Spring 2008, all credential programs are now using it to input scores. The unit regularly and systematically uses the data to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences. Evidence found in the IR and gained from interviews with faculty note that all faculty now use SIMS for data collection and analysis purposes.</p> <p>The unit analyses program evaluation and performance assessment to initiate changes in programs and unit operations. Evidence from biennial reports, interviews, and the IR reflect that although data is limited, analysis of the existing data is occurring and being used to initiate changes. Data from an analysis of key assignments is used to modify or make changes when or where they occur. The Education Specialist Mild and Moderate Disability Credential after analyzing its data increased clinical experiences in SPED 775. The Education Administration Program plans an analysis of courses where scores were less than 4 for all students as more data is collected.</p> <p>Faculty have access to candidate assessment data and data system through SIMS. Faculty are able to login to SIMS, view and input final course grades and summative data. The assessment data is now a part of SFSU, SIMS database and is accessible to administrators across campus. Evidence from interviews and the IR cites this accessibility as creating a greater awareness of credential programs by central administrators. SIMS was expanded and screens were entered into the program to include formative data as well as summative data. Information gained from interviews cites that electronic portfolios are also used in accessing candidate assessment by the Education Specialist Credential in Mild-Moderate Disabilities.</p> <p>Candidate assessment data are regularly shared with candidates and faculty respectively to help them reflect on and improve their performance. Information gained from interviews gives evidence that faculty regularly share assessment data with candidates. The electronic portfolio</p> | | | |

was cited as an avenue for candidates self reflection. Constant reflection is received by both quantitative and qualitative data. Student evaluation meetings are held to identify candidates who are in need of improvement. Intervention Protocol is also in place for candidates who receive low scores on key assignments.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The faculty at SFSU, under the leadership of the Dean and Acting Coordinator of Accreditation and Evaluation, developed a comprehensive summative assessment system using many of the resources already available within the university. The institution has defined seven assessments categories that cut across all programs and then key assignments from courses in the various programs that represent these categories. The assessment system is built around state and national standards, as well as, SFSU's conceptual framework. The system is now collecting, storing, and analyzing data to monitor candidate progress and to manage and improve unit operation.

Single Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards

At the initial site visit, the team determined that one program standard was *Not Met*.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors

Although there is evidence that a student teaching handbook is available and given to master teachers, and site administrators, as well as internship site supervisors, there is no evidence of opportunities for parties involved to "complete training in teacher development."

Institutional Response (2008)

The institution created a Student Teaching Task Force in fall 2007. The Task Force has met six times, reviewed how other universities organize their student teaching procedures and made recommendations to the department chair. The recommendations include the formation of Professional Development Schools (PDS) with a SFSU faculty member assigned to the PDS and responsible for collaborating with master teachers and site administrators at the school, providing professional development for master teachers, and being provided .20 release time to serve in the PDS. In addition, the program has an updated student teacher handbook that is provided to all master teachers and administrators. The Task Force has also recommended the formation of an Advisory Board, composed of key district administrators, to increase the communication and collaboration between the program and the field placement sites. For this year, the Field Placement Coordinator or one of the university field supervisors has visited all placement sites and met with master teachers. Beginning in fall 2007, the student teacher to faculty supervisor was reduced to 2 to 1 from 3 to 1.

Revisit Team Finding (2008)

The Student Teaching Task Force has just begun its work, the Advisory Board has not yet met, and the PDS structure has not yet been implemented. The team recognizes the increased focus and efforts on the procedures related to student teaching placement and supervision but suggests a report in one year on the activities. Standard 15 was deemed to be *Met with Concerns*

Revisit Team Finding (2009)

The Student Teaching Task Force has been in place for over a year. The chair of the single subject teaching credential program has worked with faculty and university supervisors to develop a system where the university supervisors have a slightly reduced load for supervision and in addition the university supervisors are responsible for orienting and providing in-service for all district employed field supervisors. University supervisors have assigned to schools and work with all SFSU field supervisors, and any additional interested staff, at the assigned school site. The process allows SFSU to explain its credential program to interested K-12 staff and ensure that all candidates receive appropriate supervision during field placement. Standard 15 is now **Met**.

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

Findings on Standards

At the initial site visit, the team determined that two program standards were **Not Met**.

Standard 7: Application and Reinforcement Through Field Experiences

Standard 16: Advanced Clinical Experiences

There was no field placement component in the Reading Certificate Program and there was no advanced clinical experience in the Reading Specialist Credential Program. Faculty cite financial constraints as a factor. Although there was no formal field placement or advanced clinical experience, in EED 770 and EED 771, candidates administer assessments to students and make recommendations for interventions. However, there was no requirement to plan and implement lessons in the field, nor do candidates conduct interventions with struggling readers. EED 770 and EED 771 are heavily research-based, with no clinical intervention as a follow through to the assigned assessments.

Institutional Response (2008)

Beginning in summer 2007, the institution reviewed its courses and revised syllabi to explicitly reflect the full range of content required by the standards. All candidates plan and implement lessons in the field and conduct interventions with struggling readers across a range of grade levels. A proposal for a course focusing on Adolescent Literacy has been submitted but not installed due to budget constraints. The COE is considering other options, (e.g. summer institutes, using class meetings for the professor to observe students in the field, and using advanced students to mentor beginning students) to meet the Standard with minimal fiscal impact.

Revisit Team Finding (2008)

The definition of field experience assumes some type of clinical supervision in the field. The institution has not yet put in place field supervision for the reading programs. These standards are now **Met with Concerns**.

Revisit Team Finding (2009)

The field supervision for the Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential programs is now in place. These two standards are now **Met**.